

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JONATHAN MENA,

Plaintiff,

-v-

CITY OF NEW YORK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 13-cv-2430 (RJS)
OPINION AND ORDER

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, District Judge:

Plaintiff Jonathan Mena, who is currently incarcerated and proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (“Section 1983”) against Correction Officer Benjamin Eason (“Defendant”), alleging violations of the Eighth Amendment. Now before the Court is Defendant’s motion for summary judgment. For the reasons set forth below, the motion is granted.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Facts¹

On September 9, 2012, while incarcerated at the Otis Bantum Correctional Center (“OBCC”) on Rikers Island, Plaintiff was placed in an intake cell in the OBCC’s receiving area, which he shared with two other individuals. (56.1 Stmt. ¶¶ 2–3.) Plaintiff alleges that the cell was extremely cold, vermin-infested, and too small to accommodate three men. (See Doc. No. 54-1 (“Compl.”) 4, 8.) Plaintiff further alleges that these conditions, coupled with the constant noise

¹ The following facts are drawn from Defendant’s unopposed Local Civil Rule 56.1 Statement. (Doc. No. 55 (“56.1 Statement” or “56.1 Stmt.”).) In deciding Defendant’s motion for summary judgment, the Court has also considered Plaintiff’s submission in opposition to summary judgment (Doc. No. 58 (“Opp’n”)), and has conducted an independent review of the record, notwithstanding Plaintiff’s failure to submit a statement compliant with Local Civil Rule 56.1. See *Holtz v. Rockefeller & Co.*, 258 F.3d 62, 73 (2d. Cir. 2001) (noting that district court “may in its discretion opt to conduct an assiduous review of the record even when” a party has failed to comply with Local Civil Rule 56.1 (citations and quotation marks omitted)).

made by the two other inmates, prevented him from sleeping for the entire 60-hour period that he was held in the cell. (*See id.* at 4.) Consequently, he asked Defendant, who was on duty, to transfer him to a different cell. (56.1 Stmt. ¶¶ 7–8.) According to Plaintiff, Defendant responded that there was “nothing he could do” about the situation. (*Id.* ¶ 9; *see also* Doc. No. 54-2 (“Mena Dep.”) 59:5-8.)

Plaintiff avers that he filed a grievance with the OBCC to complain about his experience in the cell. (*See* Compl. at 7.) The New York City Department of Correction (“DOC”) has an administrative grievance procedure, known as the Inmate Grievance and Request Program (“IGRP”), for inmates housed at facilities such as the OBCC. The IGRP, which was available and in effect at all times relevant to this lawsuit, requires that inmates first file a complaint with the Inmate Grievance Resolution Committee (“IGRC”) within ten days of the complained-of act. (56.1 Stmt. ¶¶ 11–12; *see also* Doc. No. 54-3 (“IGRP Directive”) § IV(D)(1).) The IGRC then attempts to resolve the grievance informally within five days, and if the grievance is not informally resolved, then the inmate may request a formal hearing before the IGRC. (56.1 Stmt. ¶ 12; *see also* IGRP Directive §§ IV(G)-(H).) An inmate may appeal the IGRC’s decision to the commanding officer, or her designee, and subsequent appeals may be taken to the Central Office Review Committee (“CORC”). (56.1 Stmt. ¶ 13; *see also* IGRP Directive §§ IV(I)-(J).) The CORC’s decision is the final and binding decision of the DOC; if an inmate disputes the decision of the CORC, he may independently appeal to the Board of Correction. (IGRP Directive at 47.) Finally, if an inmate does not receive a timely disposition at any point throughout the grievance process, he has the option of either granting an extension of time to the relevant decisionmaker

(i.e., the IGRC, the commanding officer, or the CORC) or appealing and proceeding to the next level of review. (56.1 Stmt. ¶ 14; *see also* IGRP Directive §§ IV(D)(9)(b), (10).)

As Plaintiff himself acknowledges, after submitting the grievance and receiving no response, he neither granted the DOC an extension of time nor appealed. (*See* Compl. 7–8; Opp’n 6.) In his Complaint, Plaintiff admits that he is “still waiting” for a disposition of his grievance, but does not indicate any steps he has taken to appeal any decision before the IGRC. (*See* Compl. 7.) In response to a question on the Southern District of New York Prison Complaint form asking a plaintiff to “set forth any additional information that is relevant to the exhaustion of your administrative remedies,” Plaintiff repeated a number of his substantive allegations against the OBCC staff, but did not state any information relevant to the grievance process. (*Id.* at 5.) And in his opposition brief in connection with this motion, Plaintiff again notes that he filed “several grievances about the issues in question,” but he does not indicate any specific steps he took to appeal to the IGRC or to pursue any other avenue of appellate review within the IGRP. (Opp’n 6.)

B. Procedural History

On April 11, 2013, Plaintiff commenced this action by filing a complaint against the City of New York, Correction Officer Jaquon Pickwood (“Pickwood”), Correction Officer Sauda Abdul-Malik (“Abdul-Malik”), and Defendant (collectively, “Defendants”), pursuant to Section 1983, asserting violations of his constitutional rights under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. (*See* Doc. No. 1.) On December 9, 2013, Defendants moved to dismiss the Complaint. (Doc. No. 18.) On September 17, 2014, the Court granted Defendants’ motion to dismiss with respect to Plaintiff’s claims against the City of New York, Pickwood, and Abdul-

Malik, and Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment claims against Defendant for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, but denied Defendants' motion to dismiss with respect to Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim against Officer Eason. (Doc. No. 29.) On September 11, 2015, following the completion of discovery, Defendant filed the instant motion for summary judgment, along with his brief and his 56.1 Statement, arguing that Plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies, that his Eighth Amendment conditions of confinement claim failed on the merits, and that in any event, Defendant was entitled to qualified immunity. (Doc. Nos. 53–55, 57.) Defendant also filed a notice pursuant to Local Civil Rule 56.2 alerting Plaintiff of his obligation to submit a responsive statement and informing him of the consequences of not doing so. (Doc. No. 56.) In accordance with Local Rule 56.2, this notice included copies of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and Local Civil Rule 56.1. (*Id.*) On October 14, 2015, Plaintiff filed a brief opposing summary judgment and submitted several exhibits (*see* Doc. No. 58), but he failed to submit a responsive 56.1 Statement. Defendant submitted his reply on October 22, 2015. (Doc. No. 59 (“Reply”).)

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Pursuant to Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, summary judgment should be granted “if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). There is “no genuine dispute as to any material fact” where (1) the parties agree on all facts (that is, there are no disputed facts); (2) the parties disagree on some or all facts, but a reasonable fact-finder could never accept the nonmoving party's version of the facts (that is, there are no genuinely disputed facts), *see Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986); or (3) the parties

disagree on some or all facts, but even on the nonmoving party's version of the facts, the moving party would win as a matter of law (that is, none of the factual disputes are material), *see Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).

In determining whether a fact is genuinely disputed, the court “is not to weigh the evidence but is instead required to view the evidence in the light most favorable to the party opposing summary judgment, to draw all reasonable inferences in favor of that party, and to eschew credibility assessments.” *Weyant v. Okst*, 101 F.3d 845, 854 (2d Cir. 1996). Nevertheless, to show a genuine dispute, the nonmoving party must provide “hard evidence,” *D’Amico v. City of N.Y.*, 132 F.3d 145, 149 (2d Cir. 1998), “from which a reasonable inference in [its] favor may be drawn,” *Binder & Binder PC v. Barnhart*, 481 F.3d 141, 148 (2d Cir. 2007) (internal quotation marks omitted). “Conclusory allegations, conjecture, and speculation,” *Kerzer v. Kingly Mfg.*, 156 F.3d 396, 400 (2d Cir. 1998), as well as the existence of a mere “scintilla of evidence in support of the [nonmoving party’s] position,” *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 252, are insufficient to create a genuinely disputed fact. A moving party is “entitled to judgment as a matter of law” on an issue if (1) it bears the burden of proof on the issue and the undisputed facts meet that burden; or (2) the nonmoving party bears the burden of proof on the issue and the moving party “‘show[s]’—that is, point[s] out . . . —that there is an absence of evidence [in the record] to support the nonmoving party’s [position].” *See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 325 (1986).

Typically, a “nonmoving party’s failure to respond to a [Local Civil] Rule 56.1 statement permits the court to conclude that the facts asserted in the statement are uncontested and admissible.” *T.Y. v. N.Y.C. Dep’t of Educ.*, 584 F.3d 412, 418 (2d Cir. 2009) (citing *Gubitosi v. Kapica*, 154 F.3d 30, 31 n.1 (2d Cir. 1998)). “This general rule applies equally” to cases involving

a *pro se* nonmoving party who has been provided adequate notice of the consequences of failing to properly respond to a summary judgment motion. *Pierre-Antoine v. City of N.Y.*, No. 04-cv-6987 (GEL), 2006 WL 1292076, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. May 9, 2006); *see also Gilliam v. Trustees of Sheet Metal Workers' Nat'l Pension Fund*, No. 03-cv-7421 (KMK), 2005 WL 1026330, at *1 n.2 (S.D.N.Y. May 3, 2005). Even so, the Court “may in its discretion opt to conduct an assiduous review of the record even where one of the parties has failed to file such a statement,” *Holtz*, 258 F.3d at 73, and the Court is obligated to construe *pro se* litigants’ submissions liberally, *see McEachin v. McGuinnis*, 357 F.3d 197, 200 (2d Cir. 2004).

Here, Plaintiff failed to submit a responsive Rule 56.1 statement, even though Defendant, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 56.2, sent Plaintiff notice of his obligations under Local Civil Rule 56.1 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and sent copies of both rules. (Doc. No. 56). In light of Plaintiff’s *pro se* status, the Court has exercised its discretion to independently review the record, which reveals no controverted facts. *See Holtz*, 258 F.3d at 73. In fact, as discussed below, Plaintiff’s own submissions confirm the material facts contained in Defendant’s Rule 56.1 Statement.

III. DISCUSSION

Defendant argues that summary judgment should be granted because Plaintiff has failed to comply with the administrative exhaustion requirement of the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the “PLRA”). The Court agrees.

Under the PLRA, inmates bringing claims with respect to prison conditions under Section 1983 must exhaust the administrative remedies that are available at that prison before proceeding in federal court. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). The PLRA’s exhaustion requirement is “mandatory,” thus

“foreclosing judicial discretion.” *Ross v. Blake*, 136 S. Ct. 1850, 1857 (2016); *see also Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 84 (2006) (describing the “invigorated exhaustion provision” as “[a] centerpiece of the PLRA’s effort to reduce the quantity of prisoner suits” (citations and quotation marks omitted)). Accordingly, “the law is well-settled that the failure to take an available administrative appeal, even when the initial grievance receives no response, constitutes a failure to exhaust available administrative remedies.” *Garvin v. Rivera*, No. 13-cv-7054 (RJS), 2015 WL 3999180, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. June 29, 2015); *accord Johnson v. N.Y.C. Dep’t of Corr.*, No. 13-cv-6799 (CM), 2014 WL 2800753, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. June 16, 2014) (“Assuming that [p]laintiff filed a timely grievance . . . and received no response within five business days[,] . . . [p]laintiff . . . could have taken the next step and requested a hearing.”); *Leacock v. N.Y.C. Health Hosp. Corp.*, No. 03-cv-5440 (RMB) (GWG), 2005 WL 483363, at *7 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 1, 2005) (“[T]hat [plaintiff] allegedly did not receive a response to her grievance does not excuse her from failing to exhaust the appellate remedies available to her.”); *Burns v. Moore*, No. 99-cv-966 (LMM) (THK), 2002 WL 91607, at *8 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 24, 2002) (“Thus, even if [p]laintiff received no response to his initial grievance, [p]laintiff could have sought the next level of review, in this case, to the prison superintendent.”).

At the OBCC, where Plaintiff was incarcerated, an inmate must exhaust several layers of review, even if the inmate does not receive a timely disposition at the initial stages. (56.1 Stmt. ¶ 12–14.) Here, as Plaintiff reveals in his own complaint and brief in opposition to the motion for summary judgment, he did not exhaust the OBCC administrative procedure. (Compl. 7–8; Opp’n 6.) Rather, he indicates that he filed a grievance but otherwise did not appeal or seek further review through the IGRP process. (Compl. 7–8 (noting that he is “still waiting” for disposition of his

grievances and did not seek review at the next levels within IGRP); Opp’n 6 (noting that he filed “several grievances about the issues in question,” but omitting reference to any specific steps taken to appeal)). Accordingly, Plaintiff failed to satisfy the PLRA exhaustion requirement.

The Court next considers whether there is any basis for excusing Plaintiff’s failure to exhaust administrative remedies at the IGRP. Last month, the Supreme Court forcefully disapproved of judge-made exceptions to the PLRA’s exhaustion requirement, stressing the mandatory language of the statute. *See Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1862 (“Courts may not engraft an unwritten ‘special circumstances’ exception onto the PLRA’s exhaustion requirement.”) In doing so, the Supreme Court expressly rejected the Second Circuit’s prior framework under *Giano v. Goord*, 380 F.3d 670 (2d Cir. 2004), and, by extension, *Hemphill v. New York*, 380 F.3d 680, 686 (2d Cir. 2004), which recognized a “special circumstances” exception to the PLRA’s exhaustion requirement. *See Williams v. Priatno*, No. 14-4777, -- F.3d. --, --, 2016 WL 3729383, at *4 (2d Cir. July 12, 2016) (“[T]o the extent that our special circumstances exception . . . permits plaintiffs to file a lawsuit in federal court without first exhausting administrative remedies that were, *in fact*, available to them, those aspects of *Giano* and *Hemphill* are abrogated by *Ross*.”).

Thus, post-*Ross*, the lone surviving exception to the PLRA’s exhaustion requirement is that embedded in its text: that an inmate need only exhaust those administrative remedies that are “available” to him. *Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1862; *see also* 43 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). An inmate’s failure to exhaust may therefore be excused when his prison’s grievance mechanisms are literally or constructively “unavailable.” *Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1858–59. The Supreme Court described three scenarios in which administrative procedures could be “officially on the books,” but “not capable of use to obtain relief,” and therefore unavailable. *Id.* While not exhaustive, these illustrations

nonetheless guide the Court's inquiry. *See Williams*, 2016 WL 3729383, at *4 n.2. First, an administrative procedure is unavailable when "it operates as a simple dead end – with officers unable or consistently unwilling to provide any relief to inmates." *Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1859. If prison administrators either lack the necessary authority to provide any relief or possess authority but consistently decline to exercise it, the administrative channels are not "available" within the meaning of the PLRA. *Id.*; *see also Booth v. Churner*, 523 U.S. 731, 736, 738 (2001) ("[T]he modifier 'available' requires the possibility of some relief."). Second, an administrative procedure is unavailable where it is "so opaque that it becomes, practically speaking, incapable of use." *Id.* To meet this high bar, the administrative remedy must be "essentially 'unknowable.'" *Id.* Finally, "a grievance process is rendered unavailable when prison administrators thwart inmates from taking advantage of it through machination, misrepresentation, or intimidation." *Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1860.

Here, Plaintiff has not alleged – let alone shown – that the administrative procedures at the OBCC were unavailable to him. Although Plaintiff's initial grievance received no response, this alone is insufficient to show that the IGRP acted as a mere dead end. As stated earlier, "the law is well-settled" that an inmate's "failure to take an available administrative appeal, even when the initial grievance receives no response, constitutes a failure to exhaust available administrative remedies." *Garvin*, 2015 WL 3999180, at *3 (collecting authorities). In short, the DOC's untimeliness in this case is not enough to demonstrate the unavailability of an administrative remedy. This is especially true in light of the IGRP's built-in appeal mechanism, whereby inmates may directly proceed to the next level of review in the event of the DOC's failure to respond to a grievance. (*See IGRP Directive* § IV(D)(9)(b), (10).) Furthermore, Plaintiff has not introduced

any facts to indicate that prison officials at OBCC are “consistently unwilling to provide any relief to aggrieved inmates.” *Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1859.

Nor has Plaintiff pointed to any evidence that the IGRP was “so opaque that it [became], practically speaking, incapable of use” and therefore “essentially unknowable.” *Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1859. While the Second Circuit recently found that certain administrative grievance procedures at a different New York State facility met this standard, the Second Circuit’s decision hinged on the “extraordinary circumstances” specific to the case before it, for which the applicable grievance regulations gave “no guidance whatsoever.” *See Williams*, 2016 WL 3729383, at *1, *5. Specifically, the plaintiff in *Williams* was housed in a special housing unit and segregated from the regular prison population; therefore, he gave his grievance complaint to a correction officer to file on his behalf. *Williams*, 2016 WL 3729383, at *2. However, the plaintiff in *Williams* alleged that the correction officer to whom he gave his complaint failed to file it, *id.*, and because the Second Circuit concluded that the applicable grievance regulations gave “no guidance whatsoever to an inmate whose grievance was never filed,” *id.* at 5, it reversed the District Court’s dismissal for failure to exhaust. Here, by contrast the IGRP expressly guides inmates in Plaintiff’s position who have filed a grievance but have not received a timely response and directs them to either grant an extension of time to the relevant decisionmaker or to appeal to the next level of review. (*See* IGRP Directive §§ IV(D)(9)(b), (10).) In light of the IGRP’s unambiguous directive, Plaintiff has clearly failed to show that the IGRP was “essentially unknowable.” *See Ross*, 136 S. Ct. at 1859.

Finally, the Court turns to the third scenario contemplated by the Supreme Court, in which “prison administrators thwart inmates from taking advantage of a grievance process through machination, misrepresentation, or intimidation.” *Id.* at 1859. Plaintiff has not demonstrated, or

even suggested, that prison administrators obstructed or interfered with his access to administrative remedies. *See, e.g., Winston v. Woodward*, No. 05-cv-3385 (RJS), 2008 WL 2263191, at *10 (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 2008) (concluding that plaintiff's failure to exhaust administrative remedies was not excused in light of his "failure to put forth any corroborating evidence, either direct or circumstantial, to support his claims that he suffered retaliation in the form of threats, harassment and mail tampering"). Thus, this exception to the exhaustion requirement is also clearly inapplicable.

Therefore, the Court concludes, as a matter of law, that Plaintiff has failed to exhaust administrative remedies available to him through the IGRP and has failed to offer any facts to prove that administrative remedies were not available to him. Because Plaintiff's claims are barred for failure to comply with the administrative exhaustion requirement of the PLRA, Defendant's motion for summary judgment is granted.²

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's motion for summary judgment is GRANTED.


Although Plaintiff has paid the filing fee in this action and has not applied to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court nevertheless certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that, in the event Plaintiff seeks to appeal this Order *in forma pauperis*, any appeal would not be taken in good faith.

² Although Defendant has raised other grounds for summary judgment, including that Plaintiff has failed to establish an Eighth Amendment conditions of confinement claim, and that Defendant is entitled to qualified immunity, the Court finds it unnecessary to address these other arguments because of Plaintiff's failure to exhaust remedies.

The Clerk is respectfully directed to terminate the motion pending at docket number 53, to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, and to close this case.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 19, 2016
New York, New York


RICHARD J. SULLIVAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

